

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FILED

DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM

JAN - 5 2007 *nba*

MARY L.M. MORAN
CLERK OF COURT

DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM

TERRITORY OF GUAM

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LEO PALACE RESORT,

Defendant.

Civil Case No. 06-00028

MINUTES

(☒) SCHEDULING CONFERENCE () PRELIMINARY PRETRIAL CONFERENCE
(January 5, 2007, at 9:12 a.m.)

() FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE () STATUS CONFERENCE

Notes: Representing the Plaintiff was AUSA Mikel Schwab, with Angela Morrison and Derek Li participating telephonically. Appearing on behalf of the Defendant was Tim Roberts. The proposed intervenor plaintiffs were represented by Lawrence Teker.

Mr. Teker stated that Ms. Morrison had stipulated to permit the three charging parties (Vivienne Villanueva, Jennifer Holbrook, and Rosemarie Taimanglo) to intervene as plaintiffs in this action. Without objection, Mr. Schwab signed the stipulation on behalf of the Plaintiff. Mr. Roberts agreed to sign the stipulation but reserved his right to raise objections to their claims based on the running of the applicable statute of limitation. Mr. Teker agreed to make the necessary changes to the stipulation and thereafter file it with the Court.

Judge Manibusan and counsel went over the parties' proposed scheduling order and

1 discovery plan. Judge Manibusan made certain changes and thereafter signed the parties'
2 submission.

3 Judge Manibusan announced the availability of electronic noticing and service, which is
4 available to the parties and those who practice before the Court. Registration forms will be
5 available on the Court's website and at the Clerk's Office.

6 Judge Manibusan noted that the parties have expressed an interest in an early settlement
7 conference. Mr. Roberts stated that while the Defendants are amenable to submit this case for a
8 settlement conference, he believes that certain depositions must first be conducted and that said
9 depositions are scheduled for March 2007. The Court advised the parties to file the appropriate
10 motion requesting a settlement conference when the parties believe they are ready.

11 Judge Manibusan inquired whether the parties will actually be trial ready in the 11
12 months anticipated in the Scheduling Order. Mr. Roberts stated that the parties have known
13 about this cause of action for a couple years now, so the trial date as proposed is realistic.

14 Ms. Morrison inquired as to the possibility of filing documents and motions directly on
15 behalf of the Plaintiff without the need for coordinating such filings with the local U.S.
16 Attorney's Office. She was advised that she had that option but was reminded of the
17 requirement that all submissions must contain an original signature. She was also informed that
18 she could petition the Court to accept the facsimile filings, with the originals submitted via
19 mail, and that said request could be made per document or for the entire case. Ms. Morrison
20 stated she would file the appropriate motion.

21 The conference concluded at 9:28 a.m.

22 Dated: January 5, 2007.

23
24 
25 JUDITH P. HATTORI
26 Law Clerk
27
28